



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/075,164

02/14/2002

Shinya Adachi

NGB-34408

6919

116 7590 04/24/2009  
PEARNE & GORDON LLP  
1801 EAST 9TH STREET  
SUITE 1200  
CLEVELAND, OH 44114-3108

EXAMINER

KENNEDY, ADRIAN L

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2129

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

04/24/2009

PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/075,164	<b>Applicant(s)</b> ADACHI ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b> ADRIAN L. KENNEDY	<b>Art Unit</b> 2129	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 13 April 2009.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1,6,12,13 and 16-19 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1,6,12,13 and 16-19 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 14 February 2002 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All    b) ☐ Some \*    c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)                     | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)           |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____                                      |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)          | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____  | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____                          |

Art Unit: 2129

***Examiner's Detailed Office Action***

1. This Office Action is responsive to **Amendment After Non-Final** filed **February 5, 2009**.
2. **Claim 1, 4-8, 10-12, 14-19, and 21** will be examined.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

3. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

4. Claims 1, 12, 13, and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

Having thoroughly reviewed the applicant's disclosure, the examiner has found no support for "a second road shape which has a different shape from the first road shape". Furthermore, the applicant's disclosure at paragraph 0074 teaches the matching of road shapes using locations on the road, which would not have been possible unless the roads had the same (and not different) shapes. Therefore claims 1, 6, 12, 13 and 16-19 have not been considered with regard to the prior art.

Art Unit: 2129

***Response to Arguments***

Applicant's arguments filed on April 13, 2009 have been fully considered but are moot in light of the new grounds of rejection set forth above.

***Conclusion***

Examiner's Opinion:

The examiner has considered the applicant's arguments in light of the claimed invention. Furthermore, the examiner respectfully reminds the applicant that “**during examination, the claims must be interpreted as broadly as their terms reasonably allow**”. (MPEP 2111.01 [R-5] I)

It is the goal of the Examiner to move the applicant's claimed invention towards allowability. However, as presently claimed, the applicant's claimed invention is substantially broad and is broad enough to read on the prior art of record. The examiner respectfully request that the applicant consider what the invention is, and where the line between the prior art (cited by the examiner and/or known by the applicant) and the applicant's intended invention lay. This request is made so the examiner can help the applicant arrive at claim language that not only traverses the language taught in the presently pending and/or previously disclosed prior art, but also traverses concepts taught (or suggested) in prior art known by the examiner and/or applicant which has not been cited. Also, the examiner is more than willing to have an interview with applicant, but requests that the applicant disclose what he or she considers to be the most inventive

Art Unit: 2129

portion of the claimed and/or disclosed invention.

- Regarding 101, the examiner takes the position that as broadly as the current invention is claimed, reads on nothing more than a user sitting at a computer typing code that will “solve a problem for a user”. Furthermore, without 1) being explicitly tied to another statutory class or 2) transforming some underlying subject matter to a different state or thing the claimed invention does not qualify as a patent eligible process (i.e. method) under Bilski. Additionally, without produces a concrete useful and tangible result the claimed invention does not meet the base requirements for patent eligibility under 101. Finally, in attempting to claim both disclosed and non-disclosed “problems” the applicant has attempted to preempt existing current application and non-existent future applications of the claimed invention which is not allowable under current patent eligibility standards.
- The examiner respectfully requests that should the applicant submit further correspondence, that the applicant contact the examiner prior to said submittal. This contact should be made to schedule a telephonic or in person interview with the examiner, applicant’s representative and if necessary the applicant.

Should the applicant choose to amend, the Examiner respectfully suggests that the applicant more explicitly recite what the applicant considers to be the most novel portion of the disclosed invention in the claimed invention. (The previously cited suggestions are

Art Unit: 2129

not a recitation of allowable subject matter, but are rather subject matter disclosed/claimed by the applicant which will help further distinguish the claimed invention from the prior art. Furthermore, any amendment will require further searching of the prior art.).

Claims 1, 4-8, 10-12, 14-19, and 21 are rejected.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Adrian L. Kennedy whose telephone number is (571) 270-1505. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon -Fri 8:30am-5pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David Vincent can be reached on (571) 272-3687. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

/ALK/

/David R Vincent/

Supervisory Patent Examiner,

Art Unit 2129